

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8 and 13 are amended herein. Claims 1-13 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Regarding Dependent Claim 4, Applicants have amended Dependent Claim 4 herein as suggested by the examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Regarding Dependent Claim 5, Applicants have amended Dependent Claim 5 herein as suggested by the examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Regarding Dependent Claim 13, Applicants have amended Dependent Claim 13 herein. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Regarding Dependent Claim 3, Applicants have amended Dependent Claim 3 herein. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection based on insufficient antecedent basis has been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The present office action states that Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bishop Chapman Brock, Harm Peter Hofstee, Mark A. Johnson, Thomas Walter Keller, Jr. and Kevin John Nowka's "Method and Apparatus for Controlling Power and Performance in a Multiprocessing System According to Customer Level Operational

Requirements", issued on December 28, 2004 (hereinafter Brock). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference, amended the claims and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-13 are not anticipated by Brock for the following rationale.

Regarding Independent Claim 1, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 1 includes the currently amended feature:

a management control center communicatively coupled to said plurality of management components for coordinating implementation of an equipment rack policy for power consumption and thermal load of said rack equipment;

Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 8 lines 10-15, page 9 lines 1-8 and page 11 lines 10-13.

Applicants have reviewed Brock and do not understand Brock to anticipate the currently amended feature of a management control center which coordinates implementation of an equipment rack policies.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Brock and as such, Claim 1 is allowable as it overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Regarding Independent Claim 8, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 8 herein. Applicants respectfully submit that Independent Claim 8 includes the currently amended feature:

receiving information related to a rack equipment management plan at a management control center;

analyzing policies of said rack equipment management plan associated with rack equipment operation at said management control center; and

directing manipulation of power consumption and thermal load associated with said rack equipment from said management control center.

Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Specification including page 8 lines 10-15, page 9 lines 1-8, page 10 lines 14-16 and page 16 lines 17-23.

Applicants have reviewed Brock and do not understand Brock to anticipate the currently amended feature of performing rack management with a management control center.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Independent Claim 8 is not anticipated by Brock and as such, Claim 8 is allowable as it overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 2-7 and 9-13

With respect to Claims 2-7, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 2-7 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. With respect to Claims 9-13, Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 9-13 depend from the allowable Independent Claim 8 and recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully state that Claims 2-7 and 9-13 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.


CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-13 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact David A. Plettner at (408) 447-3013 if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 10/30/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James P. Hao', written over a horizontal line.

James P. Hao
Reg. No. 36,398

TWO NORTH MARKET STREET,
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113
(408) 938-9060